

Appl. No. 09/802,698
Amdt. Dated August 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 14, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P13861-US2
EUS/J/P/05-1198

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1 and 29 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 50-57 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-21 and 29-49 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 and 29-57 as being unpatentable over Koodli (US 6,608,841). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

As described in detail in Applicants' prior arguments, claim 1, as originally filed, recited a bit error resilience method for an Internet Protocol (IP) wherein, when a header compressed packet is received by a secure link layer, compressed packets with detected errors at the secure link layer are forwarded upwards in the protocol stack for higher-level error protection. In distinguishing the teachings of Koodli, the Applicants noted that the protocol stack recited in claim 1 resides within one physical node, which Koodli fails to disclose, much less suggest. In response to Applicants' prior arguments, the Examiner states that "although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims, noting that claim 1 does not expressly state that "the protocol stack resides within one physical node." The Applicants agree that limitations from the specification should not be read into the claims. The claims, however, are properly interpreted in light of the specification, which, in this case, clearly discloses that when compressed packets with detected errors at the secure link layer are forwarded upwards in the protocol stack for higher-level error protection, the protocol stack is within one physical node. Those skilled in the art would readily appreciate, from a reading of the specification, that such was intended by claim 1 as originally filed. To make explicit what was at least implicit in claim 1 as originally filed, the Applicants have herein amended claim 1 to expressly recite that the protocol

Appl. No. 09/802,698
Amdt. Dated August 1, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 14, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P13861-US2
EUS/J/P/05-1198

stack resides within one physical node. Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious over Koodli for the reasons stated in Applicants previously-submitted arguments..


The Applicants have also amended independent claim 29 to expressly recite that the protocol stack resides within one physical node and, therefore, that claim is also not obvious over Koodli. Furthermore, whereas claims 2-20 and 30-49 are dependent from claims 1 and 29, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also patentable over Koodli.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-21 and 29-49.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: August 1, 2005

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com